

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

RP No. 43 of 2026.

[RPST No. 64440 of 2025]

Date of decision: 06.05.2026.

Swaroop Singh Rana

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and Ors.

...Respondents.

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vivek Singh Thakur, Judge.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sushil Kukreja, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting? ¹

For the Petitioner.

*Mr. Subhash Mohan Snehi & Ms. Niranjana,
Advocates.*

For the Respondents:

*Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with Mr.
Sushant Keprate, Additional Advocate
General.*

Vivek Singh Thakur, Judge

The order sought to be reviewed was passed on the basis of submissions made by learned counsel under instructions of the petitioner, as recorded in para No. 2 of the impugned order and the matter was disposed of in terms of submissions made by the petitioner and there is no error apparent on the face of record or illegality or irregularity,

¹ *Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

warranting review of the impugned order. Accordingly, review petition is liable to be dismissed.

2. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that before deposit of due amount by the petitioner, respondents had snatched all liquor vends from the petitioner and had allotted to some other person.

3. We are of the considered opinion that such action of the State does not warrant review of the impugned order, but the petitioner had and has an independent right to avail appropriate remedy for redressal of his grievance on account of any omission or commission on part of respondents.

With aforesaid observations, present review petition is dismissed, so also pending applications, if any.

**(Vivek Singh Thakur),
Judge.**

**(Sushil Kukreja),
Judge.**

6th May, 2026 (susheel)